

Spin-orbit coupling and magnetic spin states in cylindrical quantum dots

C. F. Destefani,^{1,2} Sergio E. Ulloa,¹ and G. E. Marques²

¹*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio 45701-2979*

²*Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal de São Carlos, 13565-905, São Carlos, São Paulo, Brazil*

We make a detailed analysis of each possible spin-orbit coupling of zincblende narrow-gap cylindrical quantum dots built in a two-dimensional electron gas. These couplings are related to both bulk (Dresselhaus) and structure (Rashba) inversion asymmetries. We study the competition between electron-electron and spin-orbit interactions on electronic properties of 2-electron quantum dots.

PACS numbers: 71.70.Ej, 73.21.La, 78.30.Fs

Keywords: spin-orbit coupling, Rashba effect, quantum dots

The creation and manipulation of spin populations in semiconductors has received great attention since the Datta-Das proposal of a spin field-effect transistor,¹ based on Rashba spin-orbit coupling of electrons in a bidimensional electron gas,² and the possibility for quantum computation devices using quantum dots (QDs).³ Thus, it is important that every spin-orbit (SO) effect be clearly understood for a full control of spin-flip mechanisms in nanostructures.

There are two main SO contributions in zincblende materials. In addition to the structure inversion asymmetry (SIA) caused by the 2D confinement (the Rashba SO), there is a bulk inversion asymmetry (BIA) term in those structures (the Dresselhaus SO).⁴ An yet additional lateral confinement defining a dot introduces another SIA term with important consequences, as we will see in detail. Although the relative importance of these two effects depends on the material and on sample design (via interfacial fields), only recently have authors begun to consider the behavior of spins under the influence of all effects.

The goal of this work is to show how important different types of SO couplings are on the spectra of parabolic QDs built with narrow-gap zincblende materials. We consider both Rashba and a diagonal SIA, as well as the all Dresselhaus BIA terms in the Hamiltonian, in order to study features of the spectrum as function of magnetic field, dot size, and electron-electron interaction.

Consider a heterojunction or quantum well confinement potential $V(z)$ such that only the lowest z -subband is occupied. The Hamiltonian for a cylindrical QD, in the absence of SO interactions, is given by $H_0 = (\hbar^2/2m)\mathbf{k}^2 + V(\rho) + g\mu_B\mathbf{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}/2$, where $\mathbf{k} = -i\nabla + e\mathbf{A}/(\hbar c)$, $\mathbf{A} = B\rho(-\sin\theta, \cos\theta, 0)/2$ describes a magnetic field $\mathbf{B} = B\mathbf{z}$, m is the effective mass in the conduction band, g is the bulk g -factor, μ_B is Bohr's magneton, $V(\rho) = m\omega_0^2\rho^2/2$ is the lateral dot confinement, and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is the Pauli spin vector. The analytical solution of H_0 yields the Fock-Darwin (FD) spectrum, $E_{nl\sigma z} = (2n + |l| + 1)\hbar\Omega + \hbar\omega_C/2 + g\mu_B B\sigma_z/2$, with effective (cyclotron) frequency $\Omega = \sqrt{\omega_0^2 + \omega_C^2}/4$ ($\omega_C = eB/(\hbar mc)$). The FD states are given in terms of Laguerre polynomials.⁵ The lateral, magnetic and effective lengths are $l_0 = \sqrt{\hbar/(m\omega_0)}$, $l_B = \sqrt{\hbar/(m\omega_C)}$ and $\lambda = \sqrt{\hbar/(m\Omega)}$, respectively.

The SIA terms² for the full confining potential, $V(\mathbf{r}) = V(\rho) + V(z)$, and coupling parameter α are decomposed as $H_{SIA} = H_R + H_{SIA}^D + H_K$. These three forms are: i) $H_K = i\alpha(\hbar\omega_0/l_0^2)\lambda x[\sigma_+L_- - \sigma_-L_+]\langle k_z \rangle$ gives zero contribution when $\langle k_z \rangle = 0$ (pure state parity); ii) $H_{SIA}^D = \alpha\sigma_z(\hbar\omega_0/l_0^2)[L_z + \lambda^2x^2/2l_B^2]$ is the diagonal contribution due to the lateral confinement and $x = \rho/\lambda$ being a dimensionless radial coordinate, $L_z = -i\partial/\partial\theta$ is the z -orbital angular momentum; iii) $H_R = -\alpha(dV/\lambda dz)[\sigma_+L_-A_- + \sigma_-L_+A_+]$ is the Rashba term for the perpendicular confinement dV/dz , $L_\pm = e^{\pm i\theta}$, $\sigma_\pm = (\sigma_X \pm i\sigma_Y)/2$ and $A_\pm = [\mp\partial/\partial x + L_z/x + x\lambda^2/(2l_B^2)]$. In principle these terms can be tuned since H_{SIA}^D depends on the confining frequency ω_0 while H_R depends on the interfacial field dV/dz .

The BIA Hamiltonian⁴ for zincblende materials, after averaging along the z -direction, is given by $H_{BIA} = \gamma[\sigma_x k_x k_y^2 - \sigma_y k_y k_x^2] + \gamma\langle k_z^2 \rangle[\sigma_y k_y - \sigma_x k_x] + \gamma\sigma_z\langle k_z \rangle(k_x^2 - k_y^2)$, where γ is the Dresselhaus parameter. The first (second) term is cubic (linear) in the in-plane momentum. The last term will be zero for systems where $\langle k_z \rangle = 0$, while $\langle k_z^2 \rangle \simeq (\pi/z_0)^2$, z_0 being the z -direction (perpendicular) confinement length. In cylindrical coordinates H_{BIA} can be written as $H_{BIA} = H_D^L + H_D^C$, where $H_D^L = -i(\gamma/\lambda)[\sigma_+L_+A_+ - \sigma_-L_-A_-]\langle k_z^2 \rangle$ is the linear term and, after long algebra manipulation,⁶ the cubic term becomes $H_D^C = i(\gamma/\lambda^3)[\sigma_-L_+^3H_1 + \sigma_+L_-^3H_2 + \sigma_-L_-H_3 + \sigma_+L_+H_4]$, where $H_i = A_i + \frac{\lambda^2}{l_B^2}B_i + \frac{\lambda^4}{l_B^4}C_i + \frac{\lambda^6}{l_B^6}D_i$, with $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. The long expressions for the sixteen functions A_i , B_i , C_i , D_i are given in Ref. [6].

Finally the electron-electron interaction $H_{ee} = e^2/[\epsilon|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|]$, with ϵ being the dielectric constant of the material, is expanded into Bessel functions $J_k(\xi)$ as $H_{ee} = (\hbar\Omega\lambda/a_B)\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{ik(\theta_1 - \theta_2)} \int_0^\infty d\xi J_k(\xi x_1)J_k(\xi x_2)e^{-\xi z_0/\lambda}$, where $a_B = \epsilon\hbar^2/(me^2)$ is the effective Bohr radius. The FD basis states must be properly antisymmetrized to describe unperturbed spin eigenstates.⁶

Summarizing, our total single-particle Hamiltonian is given by $H = H_0 + H_{SIA}^D + H_R + H_D^L + H_D^C$. For the

two-particle case, we study the states and spectrum of $H + H_{ee}$. Parameters for InSb are in Ref. [7].

We present results by analyzing the role of each **SO** term in the Hamiltonian. We take into account all states in the **FD** basis having $n \leq 4$ and $|l| \leq 9$ in our numerical diagonalization, which is equivalent to the first ten energy shells at zero field and embodies a total of 110 basis states. The sequence of **FD** states of H_0 starts at zero B -field with $\{n, l, \sigma_Z\} \equiv \{0, 0, \pm 1\}$, followed by the degenerate set $\{0, -1, \pm 1\}$ and $\{0, 1, \pm 1\}$. The next energy shell is composed by $\{0, -2, \pm 1\}$, $\{1, 0, \pm 1\}$, and $\{0, 2, \pm 1\}$.⁵ Spin and orbital degeneracies are broken by B and the states with negative l and positive σ_Z acquire lower energies because of the negative g -factor of InSb. The lowest **FD** crossing occurs between states $\{0, 0, -1\}$ and $\{0, -1, +1\}$, at a critical field $B_C^0 = \tilde{m}\hbar\omega_0/[\mu_B\sqrt{\tilde{m}|g|(\tilde{m}|g|+2)}]$. The moderate value of B_C^0 in InSb ($\simeq 2.6$ T for $\hbar\omega_0 = 15$ meV) is a direct consequence of its large $|g|$ factor.⁷ For GaAs ($|g| = 0.44$, $\tilde{m} = m/m_0 = 0.067$), this level crossing would appear only at $B_C^0(\text{GaAs}) \simeq 9.5$ T for a much smaller confinement, $\hbar\omega_0 = 2$ meV, corresponding to a regime where Landau levels are well defined.

Any figure showing spectrum has the structure: Panel *A* shows **QD** spectrum for the full **FD** basis (110 states); Panel *B* shows a zoom on the three lowest shells, plus inset with another zoom on the 4 levels of the second shell; Panel *C* and *D* show, respectively, the B -evolution of spin σ_Z and orbital l angular momenta, for the full **FD** basis, while their insets take into account only the lowest 7 **QD** levels.

Figure 1 shows the simultaneous addition of both **SIA** terms, H_{SIA}^D and H_R , to H_0 . The diagonal term H_{SIA}^D causes small splittings on the zero-field spectrum and readjust the sequence of states according to total angular momentum $j = l + \sigma_Z/2$. For example, the highest (lowest) zero-field energy level in the second shell has $j = 3/2$ ($j = 1/2$). Since H_{SIA}^D does not induce shift on the accidental degeneracy points of the **FD** spectrum at finite fields, the first level crossing occurs at a critical value $B_C \simeq B_C^0 \simeq 2.6$ T. Also, this term does not induce any level mixture on the **FD** states. The Rashba term H_R introduces a strong state mixture for any magnitude of α . This is evident for any pair of **FD** levels satisfying $\Delta l = -\Delta\sigma_Z/2 = \pm 1$ that show a crossing at given accidental degeneracy of the **FD** spectrum. The induced mixture converts this crossing at B_C^0 to an anticrossing (**AC**), at a shifted critical field $B_C \simeq 2.5$ T $\lesssim B_C^0$, with an energy minigap. Higher energy levels, also satisfying this selection rule, present **ACs** around the same value of B_C , and gives origin to the observed collapse in both σ_Z and l quantum numbers at $B \simeq 2.5$ T, shown in Panels *C* and *D*. The range of critical fields (between 2.1 and 2.6 T), and the size of the minigaps opened at those **AC** regions, are proportional to the magnitude of α . H_R also induces small splittings in the zero-field spectrum and slightly shifts the accidental degeneracy points at finite fields. After adding both **SIA** terms simultaneously (full spectrum in Panel *A*), one can see in the inset of Panel *B* that the ordering of states is the one determined by H_{SIA}^D . However, the energies of states $j = 3/2$ at 30 meV and $j = 1/2$ at a slightly smaller value, as well as the value of field ($B \gtrsim 0.1$ T) where the normal state ordering (the one existing in the absence of SO terms) for $g < 0$ material is restored, are determined by H_R . For increasing energy, the ordering for this second shell is $\{0, -1, +1\}$, $\{0, -1, -1\}$, $\{0, 1, +1\}$, $\{0, 1, -1\}$. The width of critical fields becomes wider, between 2.2 and 3.6 T, as seen in Panel *C*. Furthermore, Panel *D* shows that orbitals having $l < 0$ ($l > 0$) present **ACs** at fields smaller (larger) than the field $B_C \simeq 2.55$ T where occurred the first **AC** (see insets of Panels *C* and *D*). For a future comparison notice, in Panel *B*, that the first **AC** near 50 meV involving $n = 1$ states $\{0, 1, -1\}$ and $\{1, 0, +1\}$ occurs at that same B_C value. In general, **ACs** between states with any n value occur inside the same unique range of critical fields, as shown in Panels *C* and *D*. Finally, observe that both **SIA** terms can be reduced by decreasing ω_0 (H_{SIA}^D) or dV/dz (H_R), and that all even and negative l states ($l = -2, -4, -6, -8$) show anticrossings.

Figure 2 shows the simultaneous addition of both **BIA** terms, H_D^C and H_D^L , to H_0 . The cubic term H_D^C , under the present **QD** parameters, has small influence over the H_0 spectrum. Small state mixtures is induced at $B_0 \simeq 1$ and $\simeq 5$ T, both involving **ACs** satisfying $\Delta l = \mp 3$ and $\Delta\sigma_Z/2 = \pm 1$. The first one, at 1 T (5 T), occurs between states $\{0, 1, -1\}$ and $\{0, -2, +1\}$ ($\{0, 0, -1\}$ and $\{0, -3, +1\}$). This term also induces zero-field splittings on the **FD** spectrum and also a shift due to matrix elements for $\Delta l = \pm 1 = \Delta\sigma_Z/2$. However, such splittings and opened minigaps at the **ACs** regions are very small. Therefore, the simultaneous addition of both **BIA** terms (full spectrum in Panel *A*), where the linear term H_D^L is the most important, drastically changes the general features of the **FD** spectrum, inducing strong zero-field splittings and shifting its accidental degeneracies to higher fields. Yet, the respective matrix elements ($\Delta l = \pm 1 = \Delta\sigma_Z/2$) does not introduce **ACs** on the lowest energy levels. As seen in Panels *C* and *D*, the mixing induced by the linear term is so strong that the **QD** states are not anymore pure states even at zero field. Notice in Panel *C* that at $B = 0$ values of $|\sigma_Z| < 0.5$ are found for high energy states, while in its inset one finds $\sigma_Z \simeq 0.7$ for the ground state. As an example of level crossings displaced to higher fields, observe in Panel *B* that the first one has moved to $B_C \simeq 3.3$ T, there is only one crossing present in the second shell at about 0.45 T (see inset), and the second one occurs a higher field around 3.5 T. Thus, contrary to the observed for **SIA** case, the normal ordering of state is no longer restored. We will come back to this fact later. As a final note, in the same inset and at zero field, the highest (lowest) energy state has $j = 3/2$ with eigenvalue equal to energy of 30 meV of the pure H_0 ($j = 1/2$ at smaller energy near 27 meV). The influence of H_D^L on the spectrum changes with z_0 .

Figure 3 shows the one-particle **QD** spectrum for full H or when all **SO** terms are simultaneously taken into account. From the previous discussions, one may identify which **SO** mechanism is dominant in each of the main

FIG. 1: Spectrum when H_{SIA}^D and H_R are added to H_0 (A and B). Critical field range for **ACs** is seen on C and D . The lowest one ($B_C \simeq 2.55$ T, insets) occurs near B_C^0 . **ACs** involving $l < 0$ ($l > 0$) orbitals are shifted to lower (higher) fields (D).

FIG. 2: Spectrum when H_D^C and H_D^L are added to H_0 . The linear contribution dominates the cubic one. Strong mixing at low fields are due to H_D^L , while the **AC** around 6 T is due to H_D^C .

signatures present on the spectrum. An enormous state mixture, even at small magnetic fields (Panels C and D and their insets), as also splittings, position and ordering of states (Panels A , B and its inset) are dominated by H_D^L , although with contributions from both **SIA** terms. The small influence of H_D^C remains around 6 T. The lowest **ACs** are induced by the Rashba term H_R , although shifted to higher critical fields by the linear **BIA** term, H_D^L . Observe that the first **AC** has moved from 2.55 T (Fig. 1) to 3.3 T (Panel B and insets of Panels C and D), and the ranges of critical fields becomes wider. However, the new feature of the full H spectrum is the clear presence of more than one unique range of critical fields where **ACs** occur (compare with Fig. 1). Details on Panels A and C : i) The first family of **ACs**, near 3.3 T (related to states between 20 and 70 meV) involves only $n = 0$ levels. The first **ACs** being between $\{0, 0, -1\}$ and $\{0, -1, +1\}$, $\{0, -1, -1\}$ and $\{0, -2, +1\}$, $\{0, -2, -1\}$ and $\{0, -3, +1\}$, ... ; ii) A second family of **ACs** around 5 T (related to states between 70 and 120 meV) involves only $n = 1$ levels. The first **ACs** being between $\{0, 1, -1\}$ and $\{1, 0, +1\}$, $\{1, 0, -1\}$ and $\{1, -1, +1\}$, $\{1, -1, -1\}$ and $\{1, -2, +1\}$, ... ; iii) A third family of **ACs** around 8 T (related to states between 130 and 180 meV) involves only $n = 2$ levels. The first **ACs** being between $\{0, 2, -1\}$ and $\{1, 1, +1\}$, $\{1, 1, -1\}$ and $\{2, 0, +1\}$, $\{2, 0, -1\}$ and $\{2, -1, +1\}$, Although lowest **ACs** in the **QD** spectrum are caused by the selection rules of H_R , the presence of H_D^L and H_D^C , in the full H , displaces and regroup all states with same n value that contribute to the minigap near a fixed critical field value.

In Fig. 4 we simulate the cancellation of zero-field splittings even in the presence of all **SO** terms, what is reasonably obtained by taking an interfacial field dV/dz four times stronger than that one considered before (see Ref.[7], other parameters remained unchanged). This is equivalent to increase the influence of the Rashba term H_R . Notice,

FIG. 3: Spectrum of full H , where H_R induces minigap regions that are shifted to higher fields by H_D^L . H_D^C has small influence but induces state mixtures. The zero-field splittings produced by H_{SIA}^D are dominated by those from H_D^L .

in Panels *A* and *B*, that not only the zero-field splittings are nearly vanished, but also the Zeeman splittings are practically suppressed at low fields ($B_0 \lesssim 1.5$ T). At zero magnetic field, an energy shell structure identical to the pure H_0 and with the same level separation of 15 meV is formed at displaced energies. In the inset of Panel *B* one sees that the energy of $j = 3/2$ level is pushed near $j = 1/2$ level, going from 30 (in Fig.3 B) to 26.5 meV (in Fig.4 B). While the zero-field splittings nearly vanish the energy minigaps increases, as seen in Panel *B*. The rearrangement of electronic levels is so remarkable that **ACs** related to the cubic **BIA** term at 1.2 T become visible (Panel *B* and insets of Panels *C* and *D*). The minigaps at 33 (44) meV involves states $\{0, 1, -1\}$ and $\{0, -2, +1\}$ ($\{1, 0, -1\}$ and $\{0, -3, +1\}$). Even though the electronic levels are less disperse here than in Fig. 3, the SO-induced state mixture is much more intense, as can be seen in Panels *C* and *D*. Between 0 and 4 T, most of the **QD** levels have $|\sigma_Z| < 0.5$ and only the ground state has $\sigma_Z \simeq 0.7$. As mentioned before, the insets of Panels *C* and *D* show that a strong Rashba term enlarges the spin-flip region near B_C .

FIG. 4: Full H spectrum with four times stronger dV/dz . Notice the cancellation of zero-field and Zeeman splittings at low fields (*A*, *B* and inset). New **ACs** due to H_D^C selection rules occur near 1.2 T (*B* and insets in *C* and *D*). The lowest **AC** is shifted back to $B_C = 2.7$ T. Notice the enormous state mixture in *C* and, at zero field, most states are displaying $|\sigma_Z| < 0.5$.

One can further appreciate the intricate balance between **SO** terms by analyzing how some quantities are affected by changes on the lateral and vertical sizes, l_0 and z_0 , or on Rashba field, dV/dz , as shown in Fig. 5. Curves with squares, circles and triangles refer to a **QD**, respectively, with parameters of Ref. [7], with z_0 doubled (smaller linear **BIA** contribution) and with four times stronger dV/dz , while the dotted curve, in middle Panel, indicates the B_C^0 field where the first **FD** level crossing occurs. The zero-field splitting (left Panel) for states $j = 3/2$ and $j = 1/2$ of

the second shell is dominated by the linear **BIA** contribution for any value of l_0 . An increase on z_0 strongly reduces the splittings because the Dresselhaus contribution becomes weaker. The reduction is even more drastic by increasing dV/dz , which makes H_R larger and, thus, may cancel or suppress zero-field splittings produced by H_{SIA}^D .

FIG. 5: Zero-field energy splittings for the states in the second energy shell (left Panel), critical magnetic fields where the first level **AC** (middle Panel) occurs, and energy minigaps opened at that AC (right Panel) as function of the **QD** lateral radius l_0 . Meaning of square, circle and triangle curves are explained in text. Arrows at $l_0 = 190$ Å show the **QD** radius where the spectra from Figs. 1 to 4 were calculated.

The critical fields B_C , where **ACs** determined by H_R occur (middle Panel, for the lowest minigap between levels $\{0, 0, -1\}$ and $\{0, -1, +1\}$), decrease with increasing **QD** size, once $B_C^0 \simeq \omega_0 \simeq 1/\sqrt{l_0}$. Its value is close to B_C^0 when **BIA** terms are not present and the inclusion of H_D^L shifts B_C to higher value. Increasing z_0 or dV/dz decreases B_C , once they will decrease the effects due to H_{BIA} . The value $B_C \simeq 2.1$ T, for $l_0 = 270$ Å ($\hbar\omega_0 = 7.5$ meV) is displaced to 1.8 (1.5 T) if dV/dz (z_0) is four times larger (doubled). This last value can be compared to reported $B_C \simeq 1.7$ T in Ref. [8], where **BIA** terms are absent. The small difference $\Delta B = 0.2$ T can be attributed to the inclusion of non-parabolicity effects. Anticrossings at such low fields may be interesting for applications due to easier access.

Finally, the minigap opened at B_C (right Panel) has their main origin in the H_R term, while the inclusion of H_{BIA} causes a substantial reduction. If the value of z_0 is doubled the splitting is enhanced slightly. A yet larger z_0 produces no significant changes. However, the splitting can be drastically enhanced by increasing the Rashba field as, for example, changing from 1 to 4.2 meV at $l_0 = 190$ Å, when interfacial field is increased four times. Measurement of those three quantities should yield important information on the relative strength of **SO** parameters α and γ .

After having studied the one-particle **QD** problem we show, in Fig. 6, the two-electron **QD** spectrum under magnetic field (parameters in [7]). On the construction of Slater determinant for two-particle states we use the 20 lowest one-particle orbitals ($|l| \leq 3$ and $n \leq 1$), which amounts to 190 possible two-particle states that can be labeled, in the absence of **SO** interactions, by the projections of orbital (M_L) and spin (M_S) total angular momenta. If no **SO** term is present in H (Panel A), we verified that the singlet ground state is located at 35 meV, while the first excited shell at zero-field is splitted by the exchange interaction, being composed by a triplet (at 47.5 meV) and a singlet (at 50 meV) states. At very small magnetic field ($\simeq 0.1$ T), the normal sequence of QD states is restored. For increasing energy and using the notation $\{M_L, M_S\}$, the ordering is: $\{0, 0\}$ for the ground state, $\{-1, 1\}$, $\{-1, 0\}^T$, $\{-1, -1\}$, $\{1, 1\}$, $\{1, 0\}^T$, $\{1, -1\}$ for the first excited triplet (T), and $\{-1, 0\}^S$, $\{1, 0\}^S$ for the first excited singlet (S). The crossing between ground singlet and first excited triplet states occurs at $B_C^{0(2e)} = 2.1$ T.

Panel B shows the **QD** spectrum for full two-particle Hamiltonian, $H_{ee} + H$. We may identify some similar features to the single-particle case. For example, the linear Dresselhaus term almost destroys the energy shell structure at zero field by shifting level crossings and inducing new zero-field splittings, while the Rashba term introduces energy minigaps in the spectrum. Panel B shows details on the competition between Coulomb and spin-orbit interactions in narrow-gap cylindrical dots. Observe that the **SO** interaction, at zero field, acts against the direct Coulomb energy and, in a sense, favoring the exchange term. For example: i) The ground state is shifted back from 35 to 31 meV, which is close to the non-interacting value 30 meV; ii) The first excited shell states have energies from 43 to 47 meV, values even smaller than the non-interacting energy 45 meV. Other important feature in the first excited shell is the observation that the original triplet is broken on its three possible terms according to the projection of the total angular momentum, $M_J = M_L + M_S$. For increasing energy order, these terms are composed, at zero field, by the

FIG. 6: Two-particle **QD** spectrum without (A) and with (B) all **SO** terms. It is seen that the **SO** energy acts against the direct and in favor of the exchange Coulomb energies. The first excited triplet, at zero field, is splitted according to the possible M_J values as explained in text. C (M_S) and D (M_L) show the lowest ACs as induced by H_R and shifted by H_D^L .

states $\{-1, 1\}$ and $\{1, -1\}$ ($M_J = 0$), $\{-1, 0\}^T$ and $\{1, 0\}^T$ ($|M_J| = 1$), $\{-1, -1\}$ and $\{1, 1\}$ ($|M_J| = 2$), in increasing energy, while the ground ($\{0, 0\}$, $M_J = 0$) and first excited ($\{-1, 0\}^S$ and $\{1, 0\}^S$, $|M_J| = 1$) singlets remain the same.

Panels C and D show the **SO**-induced mixing of those lowest states. The first **AC** at $B_C^{(2e)} = 2.7$ T involves states $\{0, 0\}$ and $\{-1, 1\}$ (H_R selection rule yields $\Delta M_L = \pm 1 = -\Delta M_S$), so that the difference between $B_C^{(2e)}$ and $B_C^{0(2e)}$ (~ 0.6 T) is basically the same between B_C and B_C^0 (~ 0.7 T) for the one-electron problem. This means that the shifting of B_C due to H_D^L is not altered by **QD** occupation, although B_C itself is decreased by increased occupation. Yet, the H_D^C selection rule becomes $\Delta M_L = \mp 3$ and $\Delta M_S = \pm 1$, and its first minigap between states $\{-2, 1\}$ and $\{1, 0\}^{S/T}$ would be visible if a higher dV/dz had been considered on the solution for the two-electron problem.

A very special difference between the one- and two-particle problems is that a strong intrinsic (no phonon-assisted) singlet-triplet transition (qubit) at low magnetic fields involving the ground state becomes possible in the two-electron case and, in principle, could be explored in implementations of quantum computing devices. As mentioned, the critical field is decreased by **QD** occupation (from $B_C = 3.3$ to $B_C^{(2e)} = 2.7$ T), and this reduction may be increased by decreasing the **QD** confinement energy. At these critical fields where the intrinsic state mixture is enhanced, the **SO**-induced spin relaxation rate (Γ) can be estimated from the minigap energy (Δ), as $\Gamma = \hbar/\Delta$. For the lowest **AC**, Δ values are taken from the right Panel of Fig. 5, from where one sees that Δ is completely changeable by the **QD** parameters and, consequently, the intrinsic rate Γ can be changed according to those parameters.

We showed that inclusion of all **SO** terms is essential in order to obtain a complete picture of the electronic structure of narrow-gap **QDs**, and discussed the role played by each **BIA** and **SIA** terms on **QD** spectra and on spin polarization of states. The combination of strong **SO** coupling in H_R and large g -factor introduces strong intrinsic mixtures and low excitations on the single-particle spectrum; the position of critical fields where minigaps occur is affected by H_D^L . We observed that the two-particle spectrum exhibits strong singlet-triplet coupling involving **QD** ground state at moderate fields, which may have significant consequences like possible use in qubits designs.

Work supported by FAPESP-Brazil, US DOE grant no. DE-FG02-91ER45334, and CMSS Program at OU.

¹ S. Datta, and B. Das, Appl. Phys. Lett. **56**, 665 (1990).

² Y.A. Bychkov, and E.I. Rashba, J. Phys. C **17**, 6039 (1984).

³ D. Loss, and D.P. DiVincenzo, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 120 (1998); X. Hu, and S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 042312 (2001).

⁴ G. Dresselhaus, Phys. Rev. **100**, 580 (1955).

⁵ L. Jacak, A. Wojs, and P. Hawrylak, Quantum Dots (Springer, Berlin, 1998).

⁶ C.F. Destefani, S.E. Ulloa, and G.E. Marques, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 125302 (2004); C.F. Destefani, Ph.D. Thesis at Universidade Federal de São Carlos, São Paulo, Brazil, unpublished.

⁷ InSb parameters: $m = 0.014 m_0$, $g = -51$, $\varepsilon = 16.5$, $a_B = 625$ Å, $\alpha = 500$ Å², $\gamma = 160$ eVÅ³. Dot characteristics: $\hbar\omega_0 = 15$ meV ($l_0 = 190$ Å), $z_0 = 40$ Å, $dV/dz = -0.5$ meV/Å. Prefactors (meV) at zero B -field: $E_{SIA}^D = \alpha\hbar\omega_0/l_0^2 = 0.2$, $E_R = -(\alpha/\lambda)dV/dz = 1.3$, $E_D^C = \gamma/\lambda^3 = 0.02$, $E_D^L = \gamma\langle k_z^2 \rangle/\lambda = 5.2$, and $E_{ee} = \hbar\Omega\lambda/a_B = 4.5$.

- ⁸ T. Darnhofer, and U. Rössler, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 16020 (1993).











